



April 19, 2002

Ms. Stacy Tuer Castillo
Walsh, Anderson, Brown, Schulze & Aldridge
P.O. Box 460606
San Antonio, Texas 78246-0606

OR2002-2002

Dear Ms. Castillo:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 161512.

The Comal Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received two requests for all information regarding the investigation of the requestor related to allegations of work-related misconduct. You state that you have released much of the requested information to the requestor. You claim, however, that some of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

At the outset, we must address the district's obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), a governmental body must ask for a decision from this office and state the exceptions that apply not later than the tenth business day after the date of receiving the written request. You state that the department received the present requests for information on January 28 and 29, 2002. The district did not request a decision from this office until February 14, 2002. Consequently, the district failed to request a decision within the ten-business-day period mandated by section 552.301(b) of the Government Code.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302; *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.--Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). Section 552.107 of the Government Code is a discretionary exception under the Public

Information Act and does not demonstrate a compelling reason to withhold information from the public. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions in general). Accordingly, none of the information may be withheld under sections 552.107(1) of the Government Code. However, the attorney-client privilege is also found in Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.

Next, we note that the submitted information constitutes information that is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) enumerates categories of information that are public information and not excepted from required disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code unless they are expressly confidential under other law. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.022(a)(1) ("a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108.") The submitted information pertains to a completed investigation and you do not claim that any of this information is excepted under section 552.108. This information must therefore be released unless the information is expressly made confidential under other law. As previously noted, the attorney-client privilege is found in Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. Recently, the Texas Supreme Court held that "[t]he Texas Rules of Civil Procedure and Texas Rules of Evidence are 'other law' within the meaning of section 552.022." *In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328 (Tex. 2001). Thus, we will determine whether the information is confidential under Rule 503.

Rule 503(b)(1) provides as follows:

A client has a privilege to refuse to disclose and to prevent any other person from disclosing confidential communications made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the client:

- (A) between the client or a representative of the client and the client's lawyer or a representative of the lawyer;
- (B) between the lawyer and the lawyer's representative;
- (C) by the client or a representative of the client, or the client's lawyer or a representative of the lawyer, to a lawyer or a representative of a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein;
- (D) between representatives of the client or between the client and a representative of the client; or
- (E) among lawyers and their representatives representing the same client.

TEX. R. EVID. 503. A communication is “confidential” if not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of the communication. *Id.* 503(a)(5).

Thus, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under rule 503, a governmental body must: (1) show that the document is a communication transmitted between privileged parties or reveals a confidential communication; (2) identify the parties involved in the communication; and (3) show that the communication is confidential by explaining that it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and that it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the document containing privileged information is confidential under rule 503 provided the client has not waived the privilege or the document does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 503(d). *Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ).

You assert that the submitted information is covered by the attorney-client privilege in that this information was communicated between the district’s Director of Services and Benefits and an attorney for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the district. Specifically, you state that the submitted e-mail messages are communications between the district and its attorneys made for the purpose of obtaining legal advice concerning the investigation into allegations of work-related misconduct on the part of the requestor. You also explain that the remaining submitted documents were transmitted between the district and its attorney for “legal advice and revisions before finalizing.” You further state that these communications were not intended to be disclosed to third persons. Upon review of your arguments and the submitted information, we conclude that this information is protected by the attorney-client privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. *See Harlandale Independent School District v. Cornyn*, 25 S.W.3d 328 (Tex. App.—Austin 2000). Thus, the district may withhold the submitted information under Texas Rule of Evidence 503.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov’t Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the

governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at 512/475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Karen A. Eckerle
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KAE/sdk

Ref: ID# 161512

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Mervin S. Leppo
158 Valley View Street
Canyon Lake, Texas 78133
(w/o enclosures)